

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

11387

tric, vehicles, metals of all kinds, processes, sizes and shapes, and so forth, used in every part of our economy as well as in space. You should have that in mind because space is just a certain point of altitude above the earth where the air or atmosphere ends. The question then is, Shall we have two sets of patent laws, one for the lower atmosphere and one for the upper? Of course, that is ridiculous. It might be said likewise that it is foolish further to have two sets of patent laws on Government contracts made by NASA and the Department of Defense, when the same companies in the same field are contracting in many cases with the Department of Defense and NASA.

James Forrestal, the outstanding U.S. Secretary of Defense in 1947, said on this same principle when change of policy for the Department of Defense on patents and inventions was sought:

This would create dangerous rigidity. It would certainly impede and altogether imperil the prosecution of a vigorous and effective research and development program. Actually, in my considered view, as I have already stated, we are dealing not with a bare possibility, but with an extreme probability that serious harm would follow.

On this particular phase of the space program in these critical times we must not risk delaying the program or hold it back in any respect.

The issue was set on the McDowell amendment very clearly by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], when he said in that debate:

It is high time that the free wheeling big business big shots who have established the present patent policy of the Department of Defense were reigned in.

I do not believe this is a correct characterization of the Department of Defense position.

On the other hand, there were opposing the McDowell amendment at that time, and urging that the McDowell amendment should be defeated, many outstanding Congressmen of both parties, and, of course, it is the position of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], because he spoke then.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. In just a minute, I will yield to the gentleman when I list the names of the participants in the debate, if I have time.

When the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL], put the amendment in on May 5, 1960, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], spoke for it. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF], spoke for it. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], spoke for it. Also the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Against it were the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]; the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS]; the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING]; the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DABARTO]; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]; and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], gave his time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr.

FORD], who was also against the McDowell amendment.

This has already been decided by a vote of 3 to 2, by this House that the change in invention and patent policy on Government research and development contracts will not apply to the Department of Defense. The McDowell amendment was defeated by this House on May 5, 1960 by a vote of 37 ayes to 104 nays. Why should the policy then be applied by the House to the space agency?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this is the last time that will be consumed on this particular amendment. I therefore ask the patience and attention of the House while I briefly sum up the situation.

The bill before the House has only one controversial provision. All of the others seem to be accepted, because they have not been debated after being first described. This is the only one. This amendment would strike out the provisions recommended by the committee to improve the patent setup, make it more in the interest of private enterprise, more in the interest of the Government and the taxpayers than it is at the present time, and perhaps take out some of the wrinkles in the present situation.

I would start what I have to say by alluding to the fact that perhaps the best informed man in the whole country on this patent situation and on how it will affect the American public is the man we put at the gate-road to watch and police the patent laws that we pass in the Congress of the United States. He is the U.S. Commissioner of Patents. That man appeared not only before the House subcommittee but the Senate subcommittee, and he strongly backs the position that we need a change in the space patent law similar to that presented to you here today. I submit that his position is well worth considering.

Not only that, something was said about submitting the matter for new discussion and consideration by another committee of the Congress. I want to tell this House today that the seven-man subcommittee that considered this provision was composed entirely of lawyers. In fact, three former judges were on that subcommittee. They worked not 1 month, not 6 months, but nearly a year on this matter. They went back to the records and saw the decisions made by the Armed Services Committee in handling such matters. They studied the Atomic Energy Commission and its organic act and all the laws relating to this subject.

The Commerce Department has a great deal to do in the handling of patents for this Nation, especially Government-owned patents abroad. The Commerce Department surely should know. The Commerce Department concurs substantially in the provisions that we offer you today. These are authorities representing the public. They are the authorities on whom we should properly rely.

More than that, I want to say that small business and big business both appeared before the subcommittee and be-

fore the full committee and recommended this sort of change. If you believe in fostering private enterprise under our type of government, you will support the change as written in the bill.

Finally, I want to say that a survey was made by the Patent Foundation of the George Washington University, under Government contract. We authorized the survey to be made partly to find out the relative merits of Government-owned patents and privately-owned patents. Would the former be put in mothballs and seldom consider by private industry? What are the results of that survey made at Government expense? They are not completed, but preliminary reports, purely disinterested, purely non-political, show that when patents are privately owned by private companies, 57 percent of them are placed in use. In addition to that, 7 percent are licensed to other users. On the other hand, the Atomic Energy Commission's own admissions indicate that less than 10 or 12 percent of the Government-owned atomic energy patents are in use today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 97, noes 118.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. Brooks of Louisiana.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 91, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I want the Record to show, as all those who were either in the gallery or on the floor could see, that on the teller vote not a single Republican supported the Quigley amendment.

Republicans have earned the title of being the champions of big business, big money, and special interests. The Republican vote against this amendment is just one more proof of where their loyalties lie.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WILLIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12049) to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 542, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

11388

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 9

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SISK. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Sisk moves to recommit the bill H.R. 12049 to the Committee on Science and Astronautics with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following changes: Strike out line 10 and all that follows down through line 8 on page 10 and renumber the succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 120, nays 269, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—120

Anderson, Mont.	George	Nix
Ashley	Granahan	O'Hara, Mich.
Aspinall	Gray	Oliver
Bailey	Green, Oreg.	Pfost
Bailing	Green, Pa.	Philbin
Barr	Griffiths	Poage
Barrett	Hagen	Porter
Beckworth	Hargis	Price
Bennett, Fla.	Harmon	Quigley
Boggs	Hays	Rabaut
Bolling	Hemphill	Randall
Brademas	Hogan	Riley
Brock	Hollfield	Rivers, Alaska
Brooks, Tex.	Holtzman	Rogers, Colo.
Burleson	Inouye	Rogers, Tex.
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Calif.	Roosevelt
Cannon	Johnson, Wis.	Rostenkowski
Celler	Karsten	Santangelo
Clark	Kastenmeier	Shelley
Coad	Kee	Shipley
Cohelan	Kelly	Sisk
Colmer	King, Calif.	Smith, Iowa
Daniels	Kowalski	Smith, Miss.
Dawson	Lesinski	Sullivan
Delaney	Levering	Teller
Denton	McDowell	Thompson, N.J.
Dingell	McFall	Toll
Donohue	McGinley	Udall
Doyle	McGovern	Ullman
Dulski	Machrowicz	Vanik
Edmondson	Mack	Wampler
Elliott, Ala.	Madden	Whitener
Farbstein	Magnuson	Whitten
Feighan	Marshall	Wier
Flynn	Meyer	Willis
Forand	Miller, Clem	Wolf
Fountain	Montoya	Yates
Friedel	Moss	Zablocki
Gallagher	Moulder	
Garmatz	Multer	

NAYS—269

Abbt	Bennett, Mich.	Chenoweth
Abernethy	Berry	Chipfield
Addonizio	Betts	Church
Albert	Boland	Coffin
Alexander	Bolton	Collier
Alger	Bonner	Conte
Allen	Bosch	Cook
Andersen	Bow	Cooley
Minn.	Bowles	Corbett
Andrews	Boykin	Cramer
Anfuso	Bray	Cunningham
Arends	Breeding	Curtin
Ashmore	Brewster	Curtis, Mass.
Auchincloss	Brooks, La.	Curtis, Mo.
Avery	Broomfield	Daddario
Ayres	Brown, Ga.	Dague
Ealdwin	Broyhill	Davis, Ga.
Barden	Budge	Davis, Tenn.
Barry	Burke, Ky.	Dent
Bass, N.H.	Burke, Mass.	Derounian
Bass, Tenn.	Byrnes, Wis.	Derwinski
Bates	Cahill	Davine
Baumhart	Casey	Dixon
Becker	Cederberg	Dooley
Belcher	Chamberlain	Dorn, N.Y.

Dorn, S.O.	Keith	Poff
Dowdy	Keogh	Preston
Downing	Kilday	Pucinski
Dwyer	Kilgore	Quile
Elliott, Pa.	King, Utah	Rains
Everett	Kirwan	Ray
Evins	Kitchin	Rees, Kans.
Fallon	Kluczynski	Reuss
Fascell	Knox	Rhodes, Ariz.
Fenton	Kyl	Richman
Fino	Lafore	Rivers, S. C.
Fisher	Laird	Roberts
Flood	Lane	Robison
Flynt	Langen	Rodino
Fogarty	Lankford	Rogers, Fla.
Foley	Latta	Rogers, Mass.
Ford	Lennon	Rooney
Forrester	Libonati	Roush
Frazier	Lindsay	Rutherford
Frelinghuysen	Lipscomb	St. George
Fulton	Loser	Saylor
Gary	McCormack	Schenck
Gathings	McCulloch	Scherer
Gavin	McDonough	Schneebeli
Glaimo	McIntire	Schwengel
Glenn	McMillan	Selden
Goodell	McSweeney	Sheppard
Grant	Macdonald	Short
Griffin	Mahon	Sikes
Gross	Mason	Siler
Gubser	Matthews	Simpson
Haley	May	Slack
Halleck	Morrow	Smith, Calif.
Halpern	Michel	Smith, Kans.
Hardy	Miller, N.Y.	Smith, Va.
Harris	Milliken	Spence
Harrison	Mills	Springer
Healey	Minshall	Stratton
Hebert	Mitchell	Stubblefield
Hechler	Moeller	Taber
Henderson	Monagan	Taylor
Herlong	Moore	Teague, Calif.
Hess	Moorhead	Teague, Tex.
Hiestand	Morgan	Thomas
Hoeven	Morris, N. Mex.	Thompson, Tex.
Hoffman, Ill.	Mumma	Thomson, Wyo.
Hoffman, Mich.	Murphy	Thornberry
Holland	Murray	Tollefson
Holt	Patcher	Trimble
Horan	Pelton	Utt
Hosmer	Porblad	Van Pelt
Huddleston	Norrell	Van Zandt
Hull	C'Brien, Ill.	Vinson
Ikard	C'Brien, N.Y.	Wainwright
Irwin	C'Hara, Ill.	Wallhauser
Jackson	O'Konski	Walter
Jarman	O'Neill	Watts
Jennings	Osmer	Weaver
Jensen	Ostertag	Wels
Johansen	Passman	Westland
Johnson, Md.	Patman	Wharton
Jonas	Pelly	Wilson
Jones, Ala.	Perkins	Wright
Judd	Pillion	Young
Kearns	Pirnie	Younger

NOT VOTING—42

Adair	Gilbert	Powell
Alford	Johnson, Colo.	Prokop
Baker	Jones, Mo.	Reece, Tenn.
Bentley	Kasem	Rhodes, Pa.
Blatnik	Kilburn	Scott
Bilch	Landrum	Staggers
Brown, Mo.	McAllard	Steed
Brown, Ohio	Martin	Thompson, La.
Buckley	Meador	Widnall
Burdick	Metcalf	Williams
Canfield	Miller	Winstead
Carnahan	George, P.	Withrow
Chelf	Morris, Okla.	Zelenko
Diggs	Morrison	
Durham	Pilcher	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Martin.
Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Baker.
Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Prokop with Mr. Meador.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Burdick with Mr. Adair.

Mrs. SULLIVAN changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. REUSS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. PFOST changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—yeas 235, nays 31.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT PROVIDING FOR REPRESENTATION IN THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH from the Committee on Rules submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 554, Rept. No. 1779) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H.J. Res. 757) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia. After general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution, and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said resolution except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary may be offered to any section of the resolution at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE PAY RAISE BILL

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday consent was granted that consideration of the pay raise bill be postponed until next Wednesday. I desire to submit a similar request today in clarified language:

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding any other provisions of the rules, I ask

unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday next for the Speaker to recognize any Member who signed discharge motion No. 6, being numbered 1 on the calendar of motions to discharge committees to call up said motion for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12231) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12231, with Mr. BASS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, in the committee's consideration of the fiscal year 1961 military construction program, it continued the several policies it had adopted in the past to the fullest extent practicable in determining the projects and funds to be approved. First and most important of these was the disapproval of projects not clearly essential to the military posture of this Nation at the present time or in the foreseeable future. We are being constantly reminded of the present world situation and the effect of breakthroughs in scientific and technological fields, all of which can change the direction of our military effort and consequently the amount of spending of military funds on short notice. Yet, the Department of Defense continues to propose project after project which are planned around obsolete or marginal concepts. In the past year, for example, the committee has seen the Air Force abandon two bases after investing millions of dollars in new construction. These had been justified only a few months previous to their closure as es-

sential to the operational requirements of the Air Force, particularly to our important Strategic Air Command. To mention a few specific areas, your committee does not feel that it can accept as essential the construction of swimming pools for officers' clubs, additional commissaries, the costs associated with the needless transfer of functions, or the construction involved in taking research and development out of the hands of private agencies and concentrating it within the military services.

Second. The committee has always insisted that maximum utilization be made of existing facilities. The services still request funds for the replacement of barracks for example while at the same time planning to continue to hold the barracks to be replaced for so-called mobilization Reserve or to use for other purposes. If the facilities are good enough to hold in standby status or for other purposes, the committee can see no reason why new construction is required.

Third. Projects were eliminated where the costs were excessive or plans were not solid. Your committee has recommended against appropriation of funds in several cases involving a complicated structure in which the architect-engineer to do the planning and design work has not yet been appointed. Again, it is difficult to understand why barracks should be priced at \$1,850 per man at one installation and at another base adjacent thereto be \$1,780 per man.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the committee has insisted on a firm, realistic program. Those projects which do not meet these standards have been eliminated.

With these policies in mind, the committee has considered budget estimates in the amount of \$1,188 million and recommends appropriations of \$885.1 million, a reduction of \$302.8 million in the estimates.

A detailed tabulation of the construction projects approved by the committee will be found at the end of the report and the specific reductions will be found in the body of the report accompanying the bill.

Many of you have asked questions about armory and other construction projects for the Reserve and National Guard components of the services. I would like to point out to you that the committee has approved all of the funds requested for these programs in the three services. The detail of the committee's action in this regard will also be found in a tabulation at the end of the report.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The committee has approved \$148,809,000 for the regular construction program of the Department of the Army. These funds when added to unexpended balances from prior years will make \$481,603,000 available for expenditure. A large portion of the funds approved for the Army are in support of the surface-to-air guided missile program, including research and development facilities for the Nike-Zeus program.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The amount of \$157,018,000 is approved for the Navy which when added

to carryover funds, will make available \$526,729,000 for expenditure in fiscal year 1961. The projects approved for the Navy relate almost entirely to the operational effort of the Navy, including facilities in support of the Polaris ballistic missile and the antisubmarine warfare and nuclear shipbuilding programs.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The committee has approved \$525,331,000 for the Department of the Air Force. This amount when added to the unexpended balances estimated to be available at the close of fiscal year 1960 will provide \$1,876,930,000 for expenditure by the Air Force in fiscal year 1961. By far the largest part of the Air Force appropriation and, for that matter, the largest single item in the entire bill, is in support of the ballistic missile program. Included in this program are operational facilities for the new Minuteman solid propellant intercontinental ballistic missile. Extremely favorable cost bids which were not adequately reflected in the estimates presented to the committee as well as modifications proposed for the Minuteman program enabled the committee to make a reduction of \$18.6 million in this program. Your committee has seen no reason to recommend excessive or blank-check type appropriations to the Congress even for this essential military program. Funds are also included in the Air Force program for the continued support of the SAC dispersal and alert capabilities, and essential support facilities for other operational missiles and requirements.

In total, the bill as approved by the committee, when coupled with existing unexpended balances, will make available over \$3 billion for the military construction program of the several services in fiscal year 1961.

Mr. Chairman, when a committee recommends a reduction such as this in defense programs the question is always raised as to whether or not we are crippling the defense effort.

First. Let me point out to you that the reductions made by the committee include \$66 million recommended by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the President.

Second. There has been more fiscal legerdemain concerned with these budget estimates than I have seen in my period of service on the Committee on Appropriations. There has been so much confusion in the air defense program, for example, that those concerned with the program who recommended changes are still studying the effects of their recommendations. All this has resulted in a military construction program represented by a dollar estimate contained in the President's budget and not at that time backed up by any specific line items submitted to the Congress. In other words, the pie was sliced for each service early in the game and once the slices had been passed out the program was allowed to develop in far too much of a haphazard fashion. As a result, it has been up to your committee to give the program a very critical look. For example, we have denied funds for family housing in overseas areas. We feel that the time has

come to stop and take a look at the cost, the desirability and the risk involved in maintaining family communities all over the face of the globe, especially in troubled areas, such as the Middle East, where dependents certainly have no business at this time. We have been so bold as to eliminate funds for commissaries in the belief that the archaic methods of operating the commissary systems of the military services are geared to providing the lowest merchandise cost possible regardless of inefficiency. This method depends upon the Congress to appropriate funds for more and more facilities so that the customers will not be inconvenienced as it is pointed out in the committee report. The committee thinks it is time this system had a complete overhauling. We have denied funds for facilities in support of certain research and development activities where the services proposed to take work being done at the present time under contract with private industry or research agencies and do it themselves or where a service proposes to start in new fields of basic research without giving adequate consideration to the requirements of the other services or to the facilities available outside the military structure.

We have insisted and will continue to insist that the Department of Defense make maximum use of existing land and facilities instead of going to the extreme, as they proposed to do in one case, of paying approximately \$10,000 per acre for land lying under water.

Mr. Chairman, we have done these things and we are presenting a realistic construction program. Those of us who have participated in the hearings and writing of this bill on both sides of the aisle do not believe that the actions taken will in any way, shape, or form retard or damage our defense effort. On the contrary, if properly implemented, these actions will add to the defense effort of this country. This bill is based on long hours of searching, exhaustive hearings, and careful and detailed committee markup sessions. I know that it will not satisfy every military service. It certainly will not satisfy every person in this House, but this is a solid bill. I recommend it to you and urge its passage. Our goal has been and will be a program which, if properly implemented by the Department of Defense and the military services, will save money, make better use of existing facilities, and keep the military construction program under continuous review by those in authority in the executive branch and the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have been asked to comment on the availability of funds under this bill for the planning required for a drydock at the Charleston Naval Shipyard in connection with the Polaris program. I am happy to state that funds are included in this bill for this project. This would make it possible to request the necessary funds for the actual construction of the project in the fiscal year 1962 program.

Mr. Chairman, in closing let me call your attention to one thing. This com-

mittee realizes that we are not running a popularity contest in handling these bills. They are very difficult and in many instances there are questions involved as to whether or not we have not cut too deeply. We have not cut any deeper than we were justified in cutting, predicated upon the testimony given to this committee. If by further study we find we have made cuts that are too deep, of course, then when these matters are presented in conference with the other body, we will be able to give them consideration.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman for bringing in a good bill.

(Mr. GRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Military Construction, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], and the members of the committee for allowing our request of \$182,000 for the construction of a much needed Army Reserve training center at Marion, Ill. The chairman was very courteous to me when I appeared before his committee last year, when we were having difficulty with the Department of the Army. This project had been authorized since 1958, however the authorization had expired before the funds were requested in a line item appropriation request, therefore we were forced to seek new authorization before the project could be funded.

Marion, Ill., has had a Reserve unit since World War I and has been serving defense needs in southern Illinois in inadequate rented quarters for many years. Today's action is good news for the many officers and men who are members of the Marion Reserve unit. It is also good news to the chamber of commerce of Marion, the city officials, and citizens of Marion and southern Illinois in general who have been fighting long and hard to have this needed training center built. We all thank you very much and I want to again congratulate the committee for providing for the defense requirements of this country in this bill.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

(Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, the bill presented for your consideration today by the Appropriations Committee provides for the construction of facilities, on a worldwide basis, to support the missions of our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Reserve components. Military services cannot accomplish their assignments to protect and safeguard the security of the United States unless they are provided with barracks, repair shops, airplane runways, and a multitude of other supporting activities too numerous to mention.

The subcommittee in charge of this bill began its hearings on March 21, 1960, and they were not concluded until the middle of May. A total of 148 witnesses were heard in support of the budget requests and the detailed hearings are published in two volumes containing a total of 1,390 pages. The published hearings have been made available to all Members of the House as well as a 48-page report containing detailed information explaining actions taken by the subcommittee and approved by the full Appropriations Committee.

New funds provided in the bill for military construction in fiscal year 1961 amount to \$885,168,000. This is a reduction in the budget estimates of \$302,832,000. But when the new funds are added to unobligated balances from prior appropriations, the services will have available \$1,595,298,624,000 for obligation in fiscal year 1961. And when the new funds appropriated in this bill are added to unexpended balances remaining from prior appropriations, the services will have available \$3,004,819,000 for expenditure in fiscal year 1961 for military construction.

Naturally there is widespread interest in this military construction bill because it carries funds for the construction of facilities throughout the United States as well as overseas. In order to provide the Members of the House with information concerning the military construction program within their own States, the subcommittee report, beginning on page 26 and carrying through page 47, lists by State and name of installation the funds appropriated in this bill.

The subcommittee has been concerned over the apparent inability of the Armed Forces to make use of existing facilities so as to obviate the necessity of requesting funds to construct new facilities. The subcommittee has given this subject more attention and study than almost any other subject connected with the program. The representatives of the services have been subjected to close examination to determine the extent to which consideration is given to the use of existing facilities, and to the transfer of facilities between the services, before new construction funds are requested. Invariably the answer is given that close liaison is maintained between the services, that transfer of existing facilities from one service to another are not only encouraged but are required when conditions justify it, and that every possible effort is being made to utilize existing facilities, instead of buying new ones, whenever it is possible to do so in view of the requirement. The trouble is that many existing facilities were constructed years ago when conventional weapons were in vogue and the services maintain that frequently they are not in the right place and do not meet the requirements of modern and sophisticated weapons systems.

This is obviously true with respect to the use of modern weapons and the deployment of military forces, but there are many instances in which the services maintain and operate supporting facilities of a commercial or industrial type, and it is the feeling of the subcommittee